

REMARKS

Claim 6 has been amended. Claim 7 has been canceled. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-6 and 8-9 remain in the application. Reconsideration and reexamination is respectfully requested.

In paper 5, claims 1-4, 6, and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,570,615 (Decker *et al.*) in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,025,282 (Nakamura *et al.*). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Independent claims 1, 3, and 6 (as amended) specify staggered line arrays where one line receives a first spectral bandwidth of light and a second line receives a second spectral bandwidth of light. Decker *et al.* and Nakamura *et al.* combined do not teach or suggest staggered line arrays where one line receives a first spectral bandwidth of light and a second line receives a second spectral bandwidth of light.

Decker *et al.* disclose staggered line arrays, but not staggered line arrays where one line receives a first spectral bandwidth of light and a second line receives a second spectral bandwidth of light. Nakamura *et al.* disclose individual photosensors receiving different spectral bandwidths, but do not disclose line arrays, staggered line arrays, or any other particular geometrical arrangement of the photosensors. A combination of Decker *et al.* and Nakamura *et al.* does not teach or suggest the specific arrangement of staggered lines receiving different spectral bandwidths of light specified in claims 1, 3, and 6. In addition, there is no teaching or suggestion to modify the references to provide the specific arrangement of staggered lines receiving different spectral bandwidths of light specified in claims 1, 3, and 6.

In paper 5, claims 5, 8, and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,570,615 (Decker *et al.*), in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,025,282 (Nakamura *et al.*), in further view of U.S. Patent Number 5,652,664 (Kusaka *et al.*). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 5 specifies line arrays having photosensors of different sizes, where different lines receive different spectral bandwidths of light. A combination of Decker *et al.*, Nakamura *et al.*, and Kusaka *et al.* does not teach or suggest line arrays having

photosensors of different sizes, where different lines receive different spectral bandwidths of light.

In paper 5, page 6 (and page 7), the examiner states that in Decker *et al.*, figure 2 illustrates 3 lines of photosensors having a first size and 3 lines of photosensors having a second size. Applicant traverses. There is no teaching or suggestion in Decker *et al.* that photosensors in any one line are a different size than photosensors in another line. In addition, this is conceded by the examiner in the last sentence on page 6 of paper 5 (and on page 8, next to last paragraph).

Nakamura *et al.* disclose individual photosensors receiving different spectral bandwidths, but do not disclose different sizes of photosensors. Kusaka *et al.* disclose line arrays having different size photosensors, but do not disclose photosensors receiving different spectral bandwidths of light. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. There is no teaching or suggestion in a combination of Decker *et al.*, Nakamura *et al.*, and Kusaka *et al.* to combine the features. There is no teaching or suggestion that receiving multiple bandwidths would benefit the focus detection of Kusaka *et al.* There is no teaching or suggestion that different sizes of photosensors would benefit the color imaging of Nakamura *et al.*

The above arguments regarding claim 5 apply equally to claim 8. There is no teaching or suggestion to combine the references to provide the limitations of claim 8.

The following comments are in regard to other art made of record by the examiner.

U.S. Patent Numbers 6,507,011, 5,602,391, and 5,055,921 do not teach or suggest staggered line arrays where one line receives a first spectral bandwidth of light and a second line receives a second spectral bandwidth of light, as specified in claims 1, 3, and 6, or photosensors of different sizes, where different sizes receive different spectral bandwidths of light, as specified in claims 5 and 8.

Entry of this amendment is respectfully requested. This application is considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

by Augustus W. Winfield

Augustus W. Winfield

Reg. No. 34,046

December 21, 2004
Fort Collins, CO 80528-9599
(970)-898-3142